UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,180	07/14/2006	Matthew P. Burdzy	LC-519/PCT/US	7258
31217 LOCTITE COR	7590 05/22/200 RPORATION	9	EXAMINER	
1001 TROUT E	BROOK CROSSING		MICALI, JOSEPH	
ROCKY HILL, CT 06067			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/22/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/597,180	BURDZY, MATTHEW P.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Joseph V. Micali	1793		
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tid d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron te, cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 cap This action is FINAL . Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pr			
Disposition of Claims				
4)	awn from consideration. re rejected.			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	oor			
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 2006 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	a) accepted or b) objected to e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/14/06, 11/6/07, 5/29/08.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	oate		

Application/Control Number: 10/597,180 Page 2

Art Unit: 1793

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Application

Claims 1-2, 4-11, 14-19, 21-22, and 27-28 are pending and presented for examination on the merit, as claims 3, 12-13, 20, and 23-26 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 1-2, 4-11, 17, 21-22, and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,080,503 by Schmid et al, in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0199652 by Deviny et al.

With respect to claims 1 and 21-22, Schmid discloses an electrochemical cell and method of making the cell comprising a first electrochemical cell component 11, a second electrochemical cell component 12 and a methacrylate sealant 50 disposed between the two components (**Figures 3a and 5a**).

Schmid does not disclose providing a boron-containing initiator or of the specifics of the initiator and the methacrylate adhesive.

Deviny is drawn to methacrylate adhesives wherein a boron-containing initiator is provided to photocure the methacrylate adhesive. The sealant comprises both a methacrylate and a boron initiator (paragraphs 0040-0041).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform the process of Schmid including use of a combined methacrylate and boron initiator, in view of the teaching of Deviny. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to provide a sufficient means for curing and setting the adhesive resin between the flow plates of Schmid and thus effectively seal the fuel cell as desired by Schmid (**Deviny**, **paragraphs 0040-0041**). Further, one of ordinary skill in the art of using methacrylate sealants would have found the combination of a methacrylate with a boron initiator to have been an obvious combination for curing and setting the methacrylate adhesive and selection of any combination of materials for such purpose would have been readily apparent to one of ordinary skill in cured methacrylate adhesives.

With respect to claims 2 and 4-6, Schmid teaches the components 11 and 12 can be electrically conductive plastic (**column 1, lines 34-41**).

With respect to claims 7-8, Schmid teaches the adhesive can be bonded to both cell components (Figures 3a and 5a) or can be bonded to only one of the surfaces (Figures 3d).

With respect to claims 9-10, Schmid teaches the components 11 and 12 are flow field plates (Figures 3a and 5a).

Art Unit: 1793

With respect to claim 11, Deviny teaches the sealant being either a mono-functional or poly-functional decomplexer (paragraph 0017).

With respect to claims 17 and 27, Deviny teaches the boron initiator is an organoborane amine complex in combination with a poly-functional aziridine (**paragraphs 0080-0081**).

With respect to claim 28, Schmid teaches the electrochemical cell is a fuel cell (column 1, lines 6-11).

4. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,080,503 by Schmid et al, in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0199652 by Deviny et al, as applied to claims 1-2, 4-11, 17, 21-22, and 27-28 above, and further in view of European Patent Pub. No. EP 1 201 722 A1 by Kneafsey et al.

With respect to claims 14-16, Schmid and Deviny do not explicitly disclose the boron-containing initiator being an alkyl-borohydride.

Kneafsey discloses that the use of alkyl-borohydrides, as defined in claims 14-16, are known polymerizing initiators in adhesive methacrylate compositions (abstract and paragraph 0030).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform the process of Schmid and Deviny including use of an alkyl-borohydride initiator, in view of the teaching of Kneafsey. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to improve the bonding strength of the adhesive (**Kneafsey**, **abstract and paragraph 0030**).

5. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,080,503 by Schmid et al, in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0199652 by Deviny et

Application/Control Number: 10/597,180

Art Unit: 1793

al, as applied to claims 1-2, 4-11, 17, 21-22, and 27-28 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0010099 by Kneafsey et al.

Page 5

With respect to claim 18, Schmid and Deviny do not explicitly disclose the boroncontaining initiator being an organoborane in combination with a poly-functional aziridine.

Kneafsey discloses using an organoborane/polyaziridine complex initiator for adhesives which have the same structure as that defined in claim 18 (abstract).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform the process of Schmid and Deviny including use of an organoborane/polyaziridine complex, in view of the teaching of Kneafsey. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to improve the shearing and bonding strength of the adhesive (**Kneafsey**, **abstract**).

6. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,080,503 by Schmid et al, in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0199652 by Deviny et al, as applied to claims 1-2, 4-11, 17, 21-22, and 27-28 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,803.330 by Sonnenschein et al.

With respect to claim 19, Schmid and Deviny do not explicitly disclose the specific boron-containing initiator being currently claimed.

Sonnenschein discloses that the use of trialkyl boranes or alkyl cycloalkyl boranes and an amine, as defined in claims 19, are known polymerizing initiators in adhesive methacrylate compositions (abstract and column 4, line 4 – column 8, line 67).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform the process of Schmid and Deviny including use of the currently claimed alkyl borohydride initiator, in view of the teaching of Sonnenschein. The suggestion or motivation for

Application/Control Number: 10/597,180 Page 6

Art Unit: 1793

doing so would have been to improve the bonding strength of the adhesive (Sonnenschein, abstract).

Conclusion

7. Claims 1-2, 4-11, 14-19, 21-22, and 27-28 are rejected.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph V. Micali whose telephone number is (571) 270-5906. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:30am to 5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry A. Lorengo can be reached on (571) 272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Joseph V Micali/ Examiner, Art Unit 1793

/Michael A Marcheschi/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793